11/16/70

Howard Dick),

First thing I did on getting home tonight, when Lil told me of your 11/22, was write Paul. I am probably (innocently) the one, for you know how I let people go through my files. However, I am also pretty sure I said there was such a file in which some of the letters (yours are not the only ones) are confidential. It is hard for me to believe, after the fuss I made about Lifton, that he forgot; yet it is hard for me to believe he did this on purpose. I am beginning to have a certain kind of fear about Paul, but not about his basic integrity. I am very sorry. I did not intend it. I certainly intend nothing to get to Lifton.

There is no time for detailed responses to many of the other things, which do not require response. No, it is not true that the clothes do not have exhib exhibit numbers. See letter agreement.

Don't go to the trouble of making me a copy of the Atlantic article. I'm expecting one. But thanks.

I am, of course, interested in the Brooks book, if and when you see.

I have already written Dick I think it unwise to take the initiative vs Paul and Alvarez for a number of reasons, but good to make the study and have others go over it. I will spend no more time of that drek until there is a prospect of publication. I think he must be more deeply disturbed by the reaction than he has shown, and embarrassed. And I think it necessary to give him nothing along the line of the medical evidence or anything we do not want others to have. This is the second Alvarez affair. There is no point in preparing their defense. On other things, I'll still be in touch with him and sending him things.

Thanks for Dick ltrs of 11/5,6, which I'll read when I can

Your 11/12 to Dick: pleasegive me also the detail on what Pn said.

I'mskimming your 11/12 to PH. I like that line about little men and little shovels very much. It is very good.

I've decided to skim Dick's before bedding. By the way, I've not read Paul's supplement yet....And I'm enjoying it that others unburden themselves as I do, even though I've come to believe it is wrong with Paul...Telling argument on soft brain tissue not being able to cause fragments to fragment into dust...We agree on ~~this~~ taking the panel's observations as dependable, separating them from their semantics, as you know from PMIII. Good point....Excellent on demanding proof from him of his postulates rather than questioning questions. I've been doing and re-emphasizing this-without response....And why does he not report dust in his melons? ...Your point(6) about the availability of non-special bullets:I told him to get a catalogue, like remington-Peters, or to ask you about them, and the Nossler. 11/5, really good. 11/6: Also good. I note here ref to panels docs ltrs and assume it did not originate with RB....You do not know him as I do, but please believe me, all of this is utterly unlike Paul. From the first I can make sense out of it only in ways he denies. I now find myself wondering, knowing him and his very conservative approach to such things, if he is provoking everyone to get real ammo to use on A. Reaching for straws? But inconsistent as anything I know of it is...I have begun to fear for his health, and I'm not alone, which is one reason I've moderated my own criticisims. The possible explanations are few and not provable....I do welcome the support of my off-the-cuff, non-expert opinions in such haste, viz .30-06 in itself is total disqualifications. When I can read his sup, I expect my comment to be brief. I hope you keep,pouring it on, for ballistics is the crux, not medial evidence in whatever interpretation. And I've needled him about not consulting you first, as I suggested. Best to both,